UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/766,789 | 01/22/2001 | Chengwen Robert Chu | 343355600020 | 8356 |

7590          10/25/2007

Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue
North Point
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| LE, DEBBIE M |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2168 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 10/25/2007 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

| APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 09766789 | 1/22/01 | CHU ET AL. | 343355600020 |

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| DEBBIE M. LE |

| ART UNIT | PAPER |
|---|---|
| 2168 | 20071002 |

Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue
North Point
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114

DATE MAILED:

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

Commissioner for Patents

This is a letter to inform you that we made a minor change to the previous Examiner's Answer to add section (11) Re;ated Proceeding(s) Appendex. Please see attached sheet (page 25) of the Examiner's Answer.

**DEBBIE LE**
PRIMARY EXAMINER

10/2/07

II).    The Anwar's reference does not need to concern the same problem as the appellant's try to solve because recognizing another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious.

Appellant argues that Anwar reference is concerned with a different problem than that appellant's claim 1 is directed because for example, Anwar reference is concerned about using "a decision tree generator where the number of dependent variables is greater than one" (see appellant's brief page 8, paragraph 4).

In response to appellant's argument that Anwar reference is concerned with a different problem than that appellant's claim 1, the fact that appellant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious.  See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). In this particular case, the feature that both Anwar and the appellant have been tried to solve is using the automatic method to split (selecting) a subset of the dimension variables in the multidimensional database (e.g., data warehouse, OLAP) because the OLAP stores large volumes of transactional data generated by enterprises.


**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

None.